Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/710,639	HALL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
•	Robert E. Fuller	3672
All Participants:	Status of Application: _	
(1) Robert E. Fuller.	(3)	
(2) Tyson J. Wilde.	(4)	
Date of Interview: 18 January 2007	Time: <u>4:00 PM</u>	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applic  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: None.		
Claims discussed: 1, 5, 26, and 28.		
Prior art documents discussed:  None.		•
Part II.		•
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		•
<ul> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
		•
	•	
•		
	•	
Blut Tulle		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applican	t/Applicant's Representative	Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner was concerned about possible ambiguities with regard to the claim limitation that the plurality of biasing elements were "opposed from one another." Examiner thought that the limitation could be read in either of two ways: that the biasing elements were axially opposed or diametrically opposed. Applicant stated that the biasing elements were diametrically opposed, so an examiner's amendment was made in order to clear up this possible confusion. In addition, some minor informalities were corrected, including lack of antecedent basis issues with regard to "the plurality of biasing elements." All changes are explained in detail in the attached examiner's amendment.